## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): C.R. Douglas Examiner Eron J. Sorrell

 Serial No.
 10/624,408
 Group Art Unit
 2182

 Filed
 July 21, 2003
 Docket No.
 P16578

TITLE METHOD, SYSTEM, AND PROGRAM FOR MANAGING REQUESTS

TO AN INPUT/OUTPUT DEVICE

## **CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via the USPTO EFS-Web system over the Internet to Eron J. Sorrell on March 29, 2006.

/David Victor David W. Victor

## **AMENDMENT**

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## Dear Sir:

This amendment is submitted in response to a second non-final office action in the above case dated December 29, 2005 ("Second Office Action"), in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 10-15, 17-25, and 28 as anticipated (35 U.S.C. §102) or obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over cited art and found that claims 9, 16, and 26 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. On March 23<sup>rd</sup>, Applicants had a phone interview with the Examiner discussing amendments to the independent claims 1, 11, and 18. Although no agreement was reached, the Examiner said he would review and reconsider the rejection in view of the discussed amendments and arguments, which Applicants submit herein. Applicants traverse the prior art rejections and submit that all pending claims 1-28 are patentable over the cited art and in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on page 2. Remarks/Arguments begin on page 8.